

Orange County Public Schools

Laureate Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Laureate Park Elementary

7800 LAUREATE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32827

<https://laureateparkes.ocps.net/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Workum, Suzanne	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional practices, and intervention. -Manages school resources, including but not limited to facilities, budget, personnel, materials, and supplies that are designed to support the school improvement goals. -Oversees high-quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement. -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups. -Ensures instruction is rigorous, relevant, and standards-based. -Supports common planning. - Supports assigned grade levels
Ramsey, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP. -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation. -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation. -Discipline -Ensures instruction is rigorous, relevant, and standards-based. -Supports common planning. - Supports assigned grade levels. -Threat Assessment Team Member -Conducts observations
Downs, Megan	Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversees discipline -Investigate problems of a disciplinary nature, document information, and report findings and decisions to appropriate individuals. -Counsel with students and parents where behavioral problems exist. -Work closely with the school resource officer.
Okraska, Maria	ELL Compliance Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ELL Compliance -ELL Progress Monitor -Coaching Observation -Arrival Duty -Mentors -Hispanic Heritage/Black History Month
Davey, Olivia	Staffing Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success. - Facilitates and supports data collection activities. - Assists in data analysis. - Supports the implementation of Tier I, II, and III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP. -Supports ESE students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance. -Monitors FTE -Threat Assessment Team Member

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Furio, Judy	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversees the media center. -Creates POs for purchases for the Media Center (books and resources). -Oversees the News Crew. -Manages Destiny. -Holds literacy lessons. -Conducts annual book inventory. -Assists with technology.
Levenson, Lisa	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Instructional support/progress monitor -Gifted Facilitator/PLC -Coaching observation -Social media
Thompson, Kathleen	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Social skills training -Threat assessment leader -Counsels students
O'Sullivan, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress Monitor/MTSS -Spelling Bee -Literacy night -Arrival duty
Blackmore, Emily	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversee the MTSS process for the school
Higgins, Marla	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Progress Monitor/MTSS -Spelling Bee -Literacy Night -Arrival duty
Newlin, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Oversees and coordinates all school, district, and state testing throughout the year. -Math/Science night -Partners in ED/Teach-In -Coaching observation -Tutoring

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholder survey data was considered along with student data when creating the SIP goals for the 2023-2024 school year by the Leadership team. Student data was reviewed with the teachers and SAC including FAST data 3-5, STAR data K-2, iReady data, Benchmark results, and ELL student data on the FAST grades 3-5. The data was reviewed with teachers during PLCs after each assessment window to determine growth and progress along with areas to focus on and adjusting intervention groups based on data. Student data was also presented during SAC after each assessment window closed.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The Principal, along with the Leadership Team, will monitor the progress of SIP goals by reviewing student data, Classroom Walkthrough data, and teacher observation data. The Principal, along with the Leadership Team will participate in grade-level PLCs to ensure instruction is aligned with the BEST standards.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	64%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	19	12	19	17	15	0	0	0	83	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	20	18	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	18	16	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	10	14	14	20	0	0	0	0	58	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	2	20	16	0	0	0	42

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	14	26	19	19	13	0	0	0	92	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	12	8	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	10	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	14	26	19	19	13	0	0	0	92	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	12	8	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	10	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	79	57	53	82	56	56	83		
ELA Learning Gains				73			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			56		
Math Achievement*	78	60	59	82	46	50	77		
Math Learning Gains				71			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			44		
Science Achievement*	87	63	54	73	61	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	60	59	59	55			74		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	70			
HSP	69			
MUL	90			
PAC				
WHT	84			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	71			
HSP	64			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	60			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	79			78			87					60
SWD	45			40			67				4	
ELL	62			63			88				5	60
AMI												
ASN	85			94			83				4	
BLK	73			64							3	
HSP	71			72			85				5	58
MUL	92			88							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	85			81			87				4	
FRL	58			57			72				5	56

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	82	73	56	82	71	62	73					55
SWD	44	48	41	46	52	44	29					
ELL	73	73	62	79	66	53	48					55
AMI												
ASN	88	79		93	90		87					
BLK	74	63		81	68		67					
HSP	77	68	54	79	64	56	60					51
MUL	95	92		76	75							
PAC												
WHT	84	77	62	83	72	71	82					
FRL	67	69	46	72	61	63	55					50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	83	71	56	77	58	44	74					74
SWD	37			41								50
ELL	63	67	50	68	71		53					74
AMI												
ASN	94	100		91	62		85					
BLK	84			64								
HSP	73	66	53	67	54	33	63					73
MUL	93			93								
PAC												
WHT	90	67		85	60	60	84					
FRL	71	56		60	42	27	65					70

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	85%	54%	31%	54%	31%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	60%	20%	58%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	59%	11%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	62%	18%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	55%	27%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	85%	59%	26%	51%	34%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 3rd-grade BEST ELA scores for the 2022-2023 school year. This grade level was in kindergarten during the 2019-2020 school year when the district shut down for COVID-19. The 4th quarter of the marking period was spent on completing workbooks provided by the district.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is students with disabilities (SWD) in BEST Math scoring 29% overall. When comparing FSA data with FAST data, SWD scored lower on the FAST. Contributing factors to lower performance could include SWD having lower comprehension skills or a lack of using strategies or accommodations when testing.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Laureate Park Elementary scored higher in all testing areas when compared to the state average. Higher scores can be attributed to common planning in PLCs, reviewing and adjusting intervention groups on a regular basis, differentiating instruction based on student's needs, and incorporating more hands-on science experiments in 5th grade.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Students in 5th grade increased 2022-23 NGSSS Science scores by 10%, scoring 83% proficient compared to 73% from the 2021-2022 school year. New actions contributed to the increase in project-based learning and hands-on science experiments.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

An area of potential concern is attendance with 83 students in grades 1-5 who have 10% or more days absent.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. K-5 Literacy Block
2. Students in the lowest learning quartile, specifically, SWD and ELL students
3. Attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA was identified as a crucial need based on 2022-2023 3rd-grade ELA scores. Students in 3rd grade scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2023 FAST ELA was 71%. When compared to the 2022 FSA ELA, 3rd-grade students scored 81%. This is a decrease of 10%

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students in 4th grade will increase their ELA scores by 6% scoring at 76% overall proficiency.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring will include but is not limited to PLCs, data chats, CWT, and teacher observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidenced-based interventions being implemented include but are not limited to Wonders Intervention resources, ExactPath, Building Vocabulary kits, and SIPPs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to increase 4th-grade student achievement in ELA.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Planning and implementing Literacy Centers during the ELA block school-wide

Person Responsible: Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

By When: By August 21, 2023.

Identify WIN (intervention) groups K-5. MTSS Coach will oversee that grade levels determine WIN groups based on the previous year's (2022-2023) student data.

Person Responsible: Emily Blackmore (emily.blackmore@ocps.net)

By When: By August 17, 2023.

The leadership team attends weekly grade-level PLC to monitor the planning of standards-based instruction, questioning, scaffolding, and literacy centers.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Interventionists will work with Tier 3 students in grades K-5 to address deficits in reading and math. Students will be provided Tier 3 interventions days a week.

Person Responsible: Brittany O'Sullivan (brittany.osullivan@ocps.net)

By When: August 14, 2023, and ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A review of the 2022-2023 PM3 ELA FAST data for our current 4th and 5th-grade students indicated the majority of students in the lowest quartile are ESE students and ELL students. The total of Level 1s on FAST ELA for our current 4th grade students is 21, 29% are SWD and 48% are ELL. The total of Level 1s on FAST ELA for our current 5th-grade students is 21, 24% are SWD and 65% are ELL. All of these students are flagged with an early warning indicator.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Laureate Park Elementary aims to improve proficiency levels of SWD and ELL students by raising proficiency levels by 3% for both subgroups of students thereby reducing the number of students flagged with an Early Warning Indicator.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitoring will include but is not limited to review of student data, PLCs, data chats, CWT, and teacher observations. In addition, IEP goal progress will be monitored along with Imagine Learning data for our ELL students with less than 2 years.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidenced-based interventions being implemented include but are not limited to Wonders Intervention resources, ExactPath, Building Vocabulary kits, Imagine Learning, and SIPP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting the specific strategies is to increase the proficiency of SWD and ELL student's achievement levels in ELA.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Planning and implementing Literacy Centers during the ELA block school-wide with specific and appropriate accommodations in place for SWD and ELL students.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Identify WIN (intervention) groups K-5. MTSS Coach will oversee that grade levels determine WIN groups based on the previous year's (2022-2023) student data.

Person Responsible: Emily Blackmore (emily.blackmore@ocps.net)

By When: By August 17, 2023.

The leadership team attends weekly grade-level PLC to monitor the planning of standards-based instruction, questioning, scaffolding, and literacy centers with specific and appropriate accommodations in place for SWD and ELL students during whole-group and small-group instruction.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

By When: On-going throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Interventionists will work with Tier 3 students in grades K-5 to address deficits in reading and math. Students will be provided Tier 3 interventions days a week.

Person Responsible: Brittany O'Sullivan (brittany.osullivan@ocps.net)

By When: By August 14, 2023, and on-going throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Laureate Park reviewed the 2023-2024 budget, current resources in ELA and Math provided by the district, along with students' needs based on data. The district-provided curriculums and resources for ELA and Math will effectively provide for the level of rigor, support and interventions for the student body, including subgroups.

In order to provide additional supports to those who are in the lowest quartile, two Interventionist positions have been purchased from the 2023-24 budget. The Interventionist will address the needs of Tier 3 students in Grades K-5 in both ELA and Math.

Additional resources being considered for purchase are Scholastic News to supplement the Social Studies curriculum. Students K-5 will have more opportunities to read non-fiction texts and improve proficiency in informational text data. The second resource being considered for purchase is Reading Plus which will support fluency and comprehension across all grade levels.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes